

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/775,216
Response filed September 20, 2006
Reply to OA dated June 5, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 12 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. In place thereof, claims 17 - 28 have been added.

Claims 17 - 28 have been added, and claim 13 has been amended in order to more particularly point out, and distinctly claim the subject matter to which the applicants regard as their invention. It is believed that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated June 5, 2006.

Claims 13 - 28 are currently pending in this patent application, claims 17, 21, 26 and 28 being independent claims.

With respect to the Examiner's outstanding objection to the language of claim 10 (as set forth in item 2, page 3 of the outstanding Action), this objection is now moot in view of the cancellation of claim 10. Added claim 26, corresponding to canceled claim 10, avoids the informality noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the outstanding objection to claim 10 is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/775,216
Response filed September 20, 2006
Reply to OA dated June 5, 2006

As to the merits of this case, the Examiner maintains the following rejections:

(1) claims 1, 2, 4 - 6 and 8 - 16 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Tominaga (U.S. Patent No. 5, 237,208); and

(2) claims 3 and 5 - 16 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on Tominaga in view of Luo (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0073783).

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections.

As indicated above, claims 1 - 12 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. In place thereof, claims 17 - 28 have been added, claims 17, 21, 26 and 28 being independent claims.

First, the applicants' claimed invention, as now recited in each of independent claims 17, 21, 26 and 28, is directed to a multiple output power source apparatus having the following significant claimed structural arrangements: (1) means for controlling a drive circuit by an output of an output monitoring circuit, whereby an output voltage is stably outputted at a desired voltage; and (2) at least two power source circuits of the claimed plurality of power source circuits outputting mutually different output voltages.

On the other hand, the primary reference of Tominaga teaches a device, wherein: (1) the capacity of each inverter in UPS is proportional to the allotted share of load; and (2) the circulating current of the inverter is suppressed and synchronous parallel operations are performed, wherein the output voltage of each UPS is equal.

Moreover, In Tominaga, plural power source devices are parallel connected in order to cope with the situation where the power required by the load becomes larger than the power supplied by a single power source device. Therefore, in Tominaga, only a single voltage is outputted.

In contrast, the applicants' claimed multiple output power source apparatus, as now recited in each of independent claims 17, 21, 26 and 28, outputs different voltages in order to cope with the situation where different voltages are required.

As such, Tominaga does not disclose or suggest the following significant claimed structural arrangements of the claimed multiple output power source apparatus, as now recited in each of independent claims 17, 21, 26 and 28: (1) means for controlling a drive circuit by an output of an output monitoring circuit, whereby an output voltage is stably outputted at a desired voltage; and (2) at least two power source circuits of the claimed plurality of power source circuits outputting mutually different output voltages.

Accordingly, since not all of the claimed elements, as now set forth in each of independent claims 17, 21, 26 and 28 (and the claims dependent therefrom), are found in exactly the same situation and united in the same way to perform the identical function in Tominaga's device, there can be no anticipation under 35 USC §102(b) of the claimed invention based on the teachings of the Tominaga reference.

In view of the above, the withdrawal of the outstanding anticipation rejection under 35 USC §102(b) based on Tominaga (U.S. Patent No. 5, 237,208) is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

Secondly, the secondary reference of Luo merely discloses a structural arrangement in which an abnormality signal and a synchronous signal are inputted and outputted by using a single terminal. Thus, even if *arguendo* the teachings of Luo may be combined with the teachings of the primary reference of Tominaga in the manner suggested by the Examiner, such combined teachings would still fall far short in fully meeting the applicants' claimed invention, as now recited in each of independent claims 17, 21, 26 and 28 (and the claims dependent therefrom). Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have found the applicants' claimed invention obvious under 35 USC §103(a) based on Tominaga and Luo, singly or in combination.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/775,216
Response filed September 20, 2006
Reply to OA dated June 5, 2006

In view of the above, the withdrawal of the outstanding obviousness rejection under 35 USC §103(a) based on Tominaga in view of Luo (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0073783) is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.


If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/775,216
Response filed September 20, 2006
Reply to OA dated June 5, 2006

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



Mel R. Quintos
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 31,898

MRQ/lrj/ipc

Atty. Docket No. **040057**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

H:\HOME\MEL\TRANSFER\040057 RESPONSE\116 due 10-5-06 w-Ext1 E-f.9-20-06